11818½ Dorothy St.,
L.A. Calif., 90049
May 21, 1968

Mr. Arnold Levine
725 E. Kennedy Blvd.
Tampa, Florida 33602

Dear Mr.Levine,

There have been several new develpments concerning that letter on Garrison's letterhead requesting the alteration of a cropped-and-reversed picture of Kerry Thornley.

1) On Sunday, May 12, I received a telephone call from Stephen Jaffe. Jaffe is a student at UCLA who is one of Garrison's "investigators". Jaffe told me that Newcomb (the photographer involved) had told him of his plight. Jaffe, in turn, notified Garrison s office. (I believe I told you of this development last week, when I called and you told me you had not received the letter).

2) On Friday, May 17, I called Stephen Jaffe, and told him that Newcomb had not kept his promise, as the letter and pictures had not been received by you in Tampa. I told him that since the letter had not been received, that as far as I was concerned, all deals were off. I told him that I was going to write a news story on the whole matter, and that the news story would now end on a most unpleasant and suspicous note. Specifically, it would look as if Newcomb had something to hide, as he had not sent the letter; in addition, it would look as though Garrison's office had somehow intervened, as Newcomb had promised on Saturday (May 18) to send the letter, on receipt from you of a letter of request, and that the letter had not been sent, after he had informed Jaffe, a representative of Garrison's office, of his plight.

To make it clear to Jaffe that I could go through with this threat, I read him the Weisberg letter very rapidly on the phone. I think he was rather suprised that I possedsed such a good copy, albeit handwritten.

3) Within half an hour, I received a telephone call from the DA's office in New Orleans. (Jaffe had apparently panicked and called them). The phoner was Tom Bethel, who made it clear that he was speaking at Assistant District Attorney Alcock's request. He wanted to make "a deal". The deal was that they would call Fred Newcomb and tell him to immediately send the letter and a copy of the pictures he worked on to you, if I would not go ahead and write such a story. I said OK. (In no way did I bind you to any agreement whatsoever.) Since they could not reach Fred Newcomb that afternoon (Friday May 17) they said they would call him on Monday, and then call me to tell me what had happened.

4) Yesterday, Monday, May 20, I had two phone calls with the DA's office. The first was from me to them, in which I reminded them to please call Fred Newcomb, as per their promise Friday, and call back and inform me of the results.

Tom Bethel then called me back and told me he had just contacted Fred Newcomb. He had told Newcomb to please mail you a copy of the letter and the pictures on which Newcomb had worked. Newcomb said he would mail the material "tomorrow" (Tuesday, May 21).

In addition, Newcomb told Bethel that he had answered your letter of request with a letter that he or his lawyer had written to you. In this letter, they request that you please contact Garrison's office and ask for permission for Newcomb to send you the material.

Bethel told me that he then told Newcomb that the phone conversation they were having right then was such authorization, and that it came from Asst.DA Alcock, and that he should please mail you the material. It was then, apparently, that Newcomb said he would mail the material "tomorrow" (May 21).

***

The purpose of this letter to you is to recapitulate these events. If you receive, therefore, a letter from Fred Newcomb or his attorney requesting that you contact Garrison's office, please realize that such letter was written before Garrison's office telephoned Newcomb yesterday (Monday May 20), telling him to go ahead and mail the material to you.

Therefore, I want to point out that in reply, if you think one is necessary under the circumstances, you have to go no further than to state that Mr. Lifton has informed you that the DA's office called him on Monday afternoon, May 20, to tell him that they had just been on the phone with Fred Newcomb, had given Newcomb the "permission" he apparently desired, and had asked Newcomb to please mail the requested material to you, and that he had promised to do so, and that you were simply awaiting its arrival. In other words, the procedures that Newcomb apparently requests in his letter replying to yours have been obviated by the DA's office phone call to him of Monday afternoon, May 20, as confirmed to me in a phone call immediately following the one they placed to him.

I think and hope that you will now receive the letter from Newcomb, and a copy of the picture he worked on.

Respectfully yours,

David S. Lifton